

COBBETT's WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

Vol. 53.—No. 12.] LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 19, 1825. [Price 1s.

TO THE
FREEHOLDERS OF
IRELAND :*On the proposition for taking from them their right of voting at Elections.*

“ The taking away of *a vote* is the
“ taking away of *a shield* which the
“ subject has, not only against the op-
“ pression of power, but that worst of
“ all oppression, the persecution of
“ private society and private manners.”

BURKE.

“ No ! I would expect, that, if it
“ were proposed to the Catholics to
“ barter the *elective franchise* for eman-
“ cipation, they would *indignantly re-*
“ *ject the unworthy compromise.*”

DR. DOYLE.

Kensington, 17th March, 1825.
IRISHMEN,

On this day, that of your re-
nowned ST. PATRICK, it would
have been peculiarly pleasing to
me to have had to address you in
strains of congratulation on the
prospect of seeing restored your
long-withheld rights ; but, alas !
my duty towards you, towards my

country, and towards myself, com-
pels me to call your attention to a
proposition for taking from you the
most valuable of those rights which
you already possess, and of giving
you, in exchange, all the satis-
faction that you can derive from seeing
the assenters to the proposition re-
warded by honours and emolu-
ments, as the price of your per-
petual degradation and slavery.

Amongst the mental pains inse-
parable from this sublunary state,
amongst the mortifications to which
man is constantly liable, and from
which no human being can plead
an exemption, one of the greatest,
is, to be compelled openly to ex-
press our decided disapprobation
of the conduct of those, with whose
names we have long been accus-
tomed to associate all the praises
which virtuous deeds are naturally
calculated to draw forth. This
painful species of mortification I
experience at this moment ; but,
painful as it is, I must do my duty :
silence in me, on this occasion,
would be treason against truth, in-
human towards you, and an ever-

lasting disgrace to myself. My English Grammar, addressed to one of my sons, concludes in these words: " My dear son, never esteem men merely on account of their riches or their station. Respect goodness, find it where you may. Honour talent wherever you behold it unassociated with vice; but honour it most when accompanied with exertion, and especially when exerted in the cause of truth and justice; and, above all things hold it in honour, when it steps forward to protect defenceless innocence against the *attacks of powerful guilt.*"

How, then, am I to look any one, and especially this son, in the face, if I remain silent while this daring attack is made upon you, whom it is proposed to strip of your elective franchise without any imputation of crime committed by you, and without the most distant chance of any benefit to you in return; how am I to hold up my head, if I hold my tongue, while you, who are both innocent and defenceless, are thus inhumanly treated? Add to this, that I am called upon to speak in defence of myself. It has been stated, in the Irish newspapers, and the statement has been copied into those of England, that Mr. O'CONNELL, on his arrival, came

to me, in order to hear *my advice*. It may, therefore, if I remain silent, be reasonably supposed, that I have, in some way or other, concurred in the originating of, or in the assenting to, this most unjust and most outrageous proposition, rather than be the author of, or an assenter to which, I would be condemned, for the rest of my life, to be shut up in my house from sunset to sunrise, and be subject to all the cruelties and indignities that even Orangemen are capable of inventing and inflicting.

The flagrant injustice of this project is calculated to prevent us from attempting any description of it, and from entering into any reasoning on the subject: indignation so completely occupies the mind, that it leaves, for a while, no room for other inmates; and, thus, the very monstrousness of the thing serves, in a short time, to cause its prodigious turpitude to be forgotten. Let us, therefore, suppress our boiling feelings, and take, if we can, an unimpassioned view of the nature and tendency of this scheme, not overlooking (for it cannot be overlooked) the conduct of those who have assented to it.

I proceed, you will observe, upon no information except that which is contained in the public

papers. I remarked on this proposition last week, and also on the proposition of *paying the Catholic Clergy* out of the general taxes; and, on this latter proposition I shall have further to remark, either now or next week, though I shall first confine myself to the *disfranchising* project. But, last week, I had no ground to proceed on but that of mere newspaper report. I have now, unfortunately, the authority of Mr. O'CONNELL himself to proceed on. He has, with his own hand, in a letter to the Catholic Association, given me the fatal text; and, therefore, before I proceed further, I shall insert this letter, it being a rule with me to give, if I possibly can, every word of any document on which I make remarks. Here, then, is the whole of this letter, which, if I am not greatly deceived, will not be soon forgotten. I shall put in *italic characters* those words which appear to me most worthy of your attention. I should further observe, that the Chairman of the Association, in announcing that he had a letter from Mr. O'CONNELL to read, told the meeting, that it was the writer's wish, that the letter should be read "as coming from a *private individual*, and not as from "a member of the *Deputation*,"

which, to say the least of it, is quite sufficient to awaken no small degree of surprise, to say nothing about suspicion.

"To the Chairman of the Catholic Association of Ireland.

London, March 7, 1825.

"SIR—I deem it a duty I owe my respected brethren of the Catholic Association, to state to them the following facts, and to mix with my statement some advice, which is certainly honest in intention:

"First—The Bill for the suppression of the Association will be read a third time this day. It cannot get the Royal Assent for some days, and it will not be in force or operation for ten days after it receives the Royal Assent. I hope I shall be in Ireland within that period, to assist in such an arrangement as may be most suited to the dignity and the interest of the Catholic body, without being in any, even the slightest degree, inconsistent with that dutiful and ready obedience which we have always paid, and in every fortune will pay, to the law of the land—obedience to the law is our first duty, our next is the peaceable and loyal pursuit, by all the constitutional channels left open for us, of that emancipation which would not be the victory of party, but would be the means of consolidating the empire, by making the people of Ireland part and parcel of the common strength of the great British nation.

"Secondly—I am able to state, that the cause of religious li-

“berty, which we advocate, is “certainly gaining ground in this “country ; much of the opposition to us I was in the habit of “attributing to bigotry, and to an “old dislike of the Irish. Since “I came here, I am convinced I “was in error, and that there is “but little of bigotry remaining, “and still less of an anti-Irish “feeling. No! the opposition to “us at present, such as it is, is “occasioned solely by an ignorance of the merits of our claims, “and by the *prejudice created by Orange calumniators*. I have “perceived that it is quite sufficient to give an Englishman accurate information on the subject of the oppressions under which we labour, and the extent of the relief which we seek, “to convert him from an opponent into a steady and warm friend. The examinations before the Committee of both Houses in this way, have done great good—and our cause is winning on the English mind, “by its native merits, in that friendly mode which is most desirable for the purpose of consolidating both countries in that cordial manner which would increase the wealth and strength of both.

“Thirdly—I have the happiness to state *my conviction that the Emancipation Bill will pass this Session*; I may be too sanguine, but *that is my opinion*. “We can never be *too grateful to Sir Francis Burdett* for the manner in which he introduced the measure, and for the unwearyed exertions he has made, “and is making in our cause. “Mr. Plunkett also, I am bound to say, and I say it willingly,

“Mr. Plunkett has shown himself most *hearty and sincere*, “and indefatigable in this business. I cannot be deceived on this point—I can pledge myself to the people of Ireland, that Mr. Plunkett is doing all that man can do—and more than perhaps any other man but himself could do to carry this Bill.

“Fourthly—I have, further, the great gratification to state that it has been *permitted to me to draw the rough draft of this Bill*, in which I am engaged, and hope to have it ready on Wednesday next.

“Fifthly—That this Bill, if it shall, as I do firmly expect, pass into a law, will put Catholics and Protestants on a level as to civil rights—excepting the succession of the Throne in the present Protestant family, which no person amongst us ever desired to see altered, and in which, as at present limited, we heartily concur—and except the offices of *Lord Chancellor of England and Ireland*.

“Sixthly—There is nothing sought for or desired in the way of security, inconsistent with the doctrine or discipline of our church. This part of the business is taken up in a way full of kindness and good sense. It is felt that, to give an emancipation bill, which, instead of conciliating, would increase irritation and jealousy, would be mere folly; and, therefore, the securities sought for, are sought for in their proper place, namely, the affectionate gratitude of the Irish people; and, in such arrangement as will make the nomination of our Prelates es-

"sentially domestic and national, "without trenching upon the canonical rights of the Catholic Church. The allegiance of our dignitaries, which was never doubted, will thus be placed within the view of the law, but nothing at all Veto, or vetois- tical arrangement, is sought for or desired. Those who are supporting the Bill at both sides of the House, are combined in putting it forward in the most cordial and satisfactory way. In short our emancipation, if thus obtained, will be just what all liberal Protestants, as well as ourselves, have desired—namely, *Unconditional Emancipation*.

Seventhly—It is proposed to make a provision, by the Bill, for the Catholic Clergy; such a provision as would give them the means of *doing acts of charity*, instead of being almost under the necessity of obtaining it. But it is not intended, by such provision, to alter or affect the existing jurisdiction of the Catholic Prelates in Ireland; neither is there any new oath required, or any thing but what the most conscientious Catholic can desire. In short, if we are now emancipated, we shall be so in the true spirit of British generosity, and in a way to make every Catholic in Ireland pour out blessings upon his Protestant fellow-subjects. I do, indeed, think, that a new era is arriving fast, when religious dissensions will cease with religious disabilities.

Eighthly—It has been suggested for some time past, by many Members of Parliament connected with the Government,

that the elective franchise, in counties, but not in cities, should be raised from 40s. to 5*l.* or 10*l.* It is not to be raised in cities, because in cities the corporations can make poor freemen; and therefore the counteracting qualification will be left low; besides, in cities there are none of those overwhelming large landed proprietors, who can make a host of poor freeholders, and traffic upon them as if they were actual slaves. The quantity of *perjury* and *crime* produced in counties, by the present system, is enormous: and the preponderating influence which the 40s. freeholders give to great landholders over the resident intellect and *honesty* of a county, is quite frightful. For my own part, I really think that raising the qualifications to 5*l.* or 10*l.* would add to the Catholic influence in Ireland; but however that may be, it is not necessary to be in any haste to form an opinion on this subject, as before any measure of this kind is adopted, full time will be given for deliberation, and for consulting the sound sense of the Irish people.

Ninthly—It is intended to give the Emancipation Bill a first reading in about a week, and then to have it printed for circulation in England and Ireland; and we shall have full time to deliberate on all its clauses. The second reading will be after Easter. I wish I did possess any influence in the Catholic Association—I wish I deserved the confidence of my beloved countrymen—if I did, I would use it just to this extent to implore that neither the

“ Association, collectively, nor, if possible, any individual belonging to it, would give any opinion upon the change of the elective franchise, until the Bill was printed, or until my arrival amongst you. Indeed, I mean to carry with me the printed Bill, after its first reading. I know something, I think, of human nature, and if I can judge from the symptoms of the times, *Emancipation* is certainly at hand.

“ I have made a great sacrifice in coming here; that sacrifice continues; I wish it were ten times as great. I do not boast of it; but I have been amply compensated in the strong belief that the Deputation has done good. The gentlemen who compose it, and especially our Chairman, Lord Killeen, deserve, I think, *eternal praise*.

“ There is one other cheering circumstance. I perceive a kind and general feeling amongst the Irish Members, who hitherto opposed us violently. Believe me, *they are worthier and better men than our passions allowed us to think*. I see the beginning of better days; of mutual oblivion of the past; of mutual affection, and real and permanent conciliation for the future. I hope I may say,

“ *Eriu, oh Eriu, thy winter is past,
And the hope that liv'd through it
Shall blossom at last.*”

“ I have the honour to be,

“ Sir,

“ Your most faithful Servant,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

Irishmen, when you were paying, or giving your pennies under the name of “ Catholic rent”; and when many persons, Protestants as well as Catholics, were contributing to the same fund, did you, or did they, imagine that the money was to assist in obtaining you a *loss of your right to vote*? Did you, or did they, ever dream that “ *emancipation*” could possibly mean *disfranchisement*? To *emancipate*, means *to make free*; and did you ever suppose, that you were to be made *free* by having taken from you the power of opening your mouths at elections? There is something so barefacedly profligate in the thing, that one can hardly comment on it with any degree of coolness.

However, let us proceed. The letter, taken as a whole, discovers great misgivings in the mind of the writer. He is evidently exceedingly embarrassed. He labours to prepare, by degrees, the Association for the fatal secret which is, at last, to come out. He seems to walk as if amongst burning ploughshares. He deprecates all discussion, and that, too, amongst those whose sole business it was to discuss. He is a member of a deputation, and he speaks as an individual, and he speaks, too, to the body by whom he was

deputed, calling upon that whole body, collectively and individually, to *suspend all opinion*. Are these so many marks of a consciousness of having done that which was *wise and right*? Are they so many indications of self-applauding rectitude? Are they so many proofs of a desire to let this matter come before you, and before the people of Ireland, fairly and without prepossession? And, lastly, are they so many reasons whereon for you to found implicit confidence in the writer? Have we, from our infancy upwards, had to observe, that he who is uncommonly eager to tell his tale first, has truth and right on his side? And have we always perceived, that an inward conviction of having acted with sincerity and fidelity leads a man to call on others to suspend all opinion on his conduct, even after he has, uncalled for, and in the absence of all accusation, put forward and pressed arguments in his defence?

Leaving to your "*sound sense*" to answer these questions, and laying aside, for the present, Mr. O'CONNELL's eulogium on Sir FRANCIS BURDETT's *friendship* and Mr. PLUNKETT's *sincerity*, let us come to his *sixth statement*, wherein he speaks of "*unconditional emancipation*" and wherein

he also mentions the first "*condition*" of this "*unconditional*" grant. Who would imagine, from the slight way in which he speaks of the "*arrangement* which will "make the nomination of our "*prelates essentially domestic and national*, without trenching on "*the canonical rights of the Catholic Church*"; who would, from this description, imagine, that there is to be a *board* of Catholic bishops to *report to the government* facts relating to the *appointment* of bishops; that this board is to act under the control of the government; that the papal supremacy is, in substance, to be set aside; that a breach is to be made in the unity of the Catholic Church; that the Catholic religion is to be degraded; and, with all convenient speed, to be first undermined and then subverted? Who, from the loose, slight, and seemingly careless description of this "*arrangement*," would imagine that such was its real character? The cause of the Catholics of Ireland has been like the "*Milk-white Hind*," because they have rejected all the propositions to make breaches in their faith, worship, discipline, and observances. Once let them begin to give way, and away go their cause and their Church. If they

can yield one point they can yield another ; and, if there be nothing in their consciences that prevents them from going half-way, who will blame the state, if it insist upon an entire conformity to the rules of that Protestant Church with which the state is interwoven ?

The *seventh* statement relates to the *payment of the Catholic Clergy out of the taxes*. This, too, is a *condition*, mind, of this "*unconditional emancipation*" ! Strange, that the *foes* of the Catholics, those who affect to entertain *fears* of the *influence* of the Catholic Clergy ; strange, that those who are, above all things, anxious to *diminish their influence* on the people ; strange, indeed, that those who are afraid, and who openly express their fears, of the influence of these Clergy in elections ; strange, that these very persons should propose to *compel* them to take money out of the taxes ; and, passing strange, that they should compel them to take this money, in order that they might "*do acts of charity*," this, according to Mr. O'CONNELL, being the *only motive* for compelling them to take the public money !

Is it not, then, marvellous indeed, that they should be made

partakers in the taxes in order to diminish their influence, by means of enabling them to "*do acts of charity*" ? Is the doing of acts of charity a thing that *usually* tends to *lessen men's influence* with those amongst whom the charity flows ? Oh ! but Mr. O'CONNELL says nothing about the *lessening of the influence of the Clergy*. He, though the proposition comes from the foes of the Catholic religion ; though it comes from the decided enemies of emancipation ; though it is a *condition* of the "*unconditional emancipation*"; though he hears it openly declared by the proposers and supporters of the project, that this money out of the taxes will make them *dependent on the Government*, and will greatly *lessen their influence with their flocks* ; though he sees and hears all this, and though it is all as evident as any fact could be if attested by ten thousand witnesses, he can perceive no effect to arise from this payment to the Catholic Clergy, other than the amiable and Christian effect of "*giving them the means of doing acts of charity*" !

What can have been the reasons, on which he founded this opinion, it is beyond my power of conjecture. Can the opinion have been founded on the circumstance,

that Mr. CROKER was the man *first* to announce in his place in the House, his resolution to propose this payment out of the taxes? Can the opinion have been founded on the circumstance, that the corrupt *press here*, at the very moment that it announced the intended measure, said, by way of defence of it, that it would "take "from the Catholic Priests the "*power of doing mischief*"; that is to say, the power of preserving their flocks from *schism*, and from the most abject slavery of perpetual duration? In short, on what can this strange opinion have been founded?

Far be it from me to say, that the Catholic Clergy in Ireland, who are, I believe, the very best body of pastors in the world, ought not to receive a reward suitable to their merits; but, as to the source and manner of that reward, I shall speak another time, and hasten now, to the other great *condition* of this "*unconditional emancipation*"; namely, the *disfranchisement* of nine-tenths of the Freeholders of Ireland, consisting of, perhaps, about *half a million of men*.

"It has," says Mr. O'CONNELL, in his *eighth* statement, "been suggested, for some time past, "by many Members of Parlia-

"ment, *connected with the Government*, that the elective franchise, in counties, but not in cities, should be raised from 40s. "to 5 or 10l." To this proposition Mr. O'CONNELL manifestly has given *his assent!* His reasons are, that, the present system causes "*perjury and crime*"; and that ("Angels and ministers of grace defend us!") he **REALLY THINKS**, that this alteration would "**ADD TO "THE CATHOLIC INFLUENCE IN IRELAND"**!"

What, then, the Members of Parliament, connected with the Government, have suggested, for some time past, that it would be *proper* to "*add to the Catholic influence in Ireland*"! Those Protestants who are Irish members of parliament, and *particularly those* who are "*connected with the Government*," and who, of course, and whose relations, enjoy the good things in Ireland; particularly those who *now predominate* in Ireland in consequence of the Protestant ascendancy and the Catholic exclusion; these persons *in particular* have, for some time, suggested, that that ought to be done which would "*add to the Catholic influence in Ireland*!" Astonishing infatuation! For, as to any *other cause*

for this opinion of Mr. O'CONNELL, I will not suppose it to exist.

But, if Mr. O'CONNELL "*really* think" this, is it not wonderful, that he should *say* it, and in public too, just at this time? He must, at any rate, be convinced, that those who have *proposed* the *disfranchisement* did not believe that such would be the effect of the measure; and he must, too, be thoroughly convinced, that they *will not believe it now*, notwithstanding he "*really thinks*" it; for, otherwise, he would be doing all in his power to defeat that very Bill which he has *assisted to frame*. So that here we have a perfect constellation of wonders: those whose well known interest, and whose notorious object it is to *lessen the Catholic influence*, suggest, and have for some time been suggesting (through *ignorance*) a measure to *add to that influence*; then we have Mr. O'CONNELL perceiving (though they do not perceive) that this measure would *make such addition*; and, next, we have him (lest they should pass the Bill that he has assisted to draw up, and that would make this addition) telling all the world, and the suggesters amongst the rest, that those suggesters are just about to *fall into their own pit*;

though, in almost the same breath, he hails the intended Bill as a *blessing* hardly to be described! We will not impute *insincerity* to Mr. O'CONNELL; but, we must not wholly forget what is due to ourselves; in abstaining from imputations on him, we must not entirely abandon the use of our own senses; we must not expose ourselves to the ridicule and scorn of mankind; and this we must do, unless we decidedly express our utter astonishment at this his strange opinion, and at his most unaccountable conduct in expressing it at such a time and in such a manner.

It is not a little strange, too, that Mr. O'CONNELL should tell the Catholic Association, that it is "*not necessary to be in haste to form an opinion* on this subject." No? Why was *he* in *such haste*, then? He not only formed, but expressed *his* opinion, and that, too, before he had taken time to obtain the concurrence of his fellow-deputies. What! was not the Bill actually *being drawn up* when he wrote? Was it not about to be presented and printed? Was not the *disfranchisement resolved on* by the framers and the mover? And, this being the case, was there any time to be lost in "*forming an opinion*" upon the

subject? Why, in God's name; for *what reason*, were the Association and the Irish nation to refrain from forming an opinion, and almost from thinking, on this most important matter, "until *he* arrived in Ireland"? How could *his* presence in Ireland change the nature or tendency of the measure? Could it make disfranchisement *other* than disfranchisement? Could it make injustice and oppression justice and freedom? Could his mere presence make black white and white black? Of all the parts of this fatal letter, I like least, or, rather, I dislike most, this anxious endeavour to prevent discussion amongst others, while it so palpably forstalls public opinion itself. The motive, whatever it may really have *been*, has the appearance of having been such as it would be painful indeed to impute to Mr. O'CONNELL. Was there likely to be *too much time* for "consulting the sound sense of the *Irish people*?" Too much time to make the common people of the whole island well informed on a subject so nearly affecting their character, their dearest present interests, and the *future fate* of themselves and their children? Too much time to make them clearly see what it was intended to do with them, and

to enable them to express their opinions and feelings on the subject! He knew that the Bill was nearly framed, that its design was to disfranchise half a million of his "*beloved countrymen*," and he, in communicating a knowledge of this outrageous intention of their foes, "implores those *beloved countrymen* to give *no opinion* upon the subject until *he arrives amongst them*!" There was no intricacy in the subject; there were no knotty points to unravel; it was no mixed matter; it was a plain, simple, barefaced, unblushing proposal to take away from half a million of his countrymen the right of voting at elections; it was a stark-naked project for the *confiscation of political rights*; and that, too, without *even the imputation of legal forfeiture*! It was a proposition surpassing any of the arts of CROMWELL: the head of the WESTMINSTER RUMP was about to outdo the head of the RUMP PARLIAMENT; and yet, Mr. O'CONNELL, in announcing the project to his "*beloved countrymen*," implores them to give *no opinion* upon the subject until *he arrives amongst them*!

Let us now come to the other *reason* which Mr. O'CONNELL gives for this measure. This is

"the *perjury* and *crime*" which the poor freeholders commit at elections; and the "*preponderating influence* which they give to "the *great landholders* over the "resident *intellect* and *honesty* of "the country." We are here met again, at the very threshold, by the fact, that it is those great landholders *from whom the proposition has come!* And we must again express our surprise, that they should be so desirous *to strip themselves* of this "*preponderating influence*!" Mr. O'CONNELL does by no means allow that the proposition came *from him*. Indeed he expressly gives the suggestion to members "*connected with the government*." He says, here, that the 40s. freeholders give these very people a preponderating influence over intellect and honesty; and, then, we have to believe, that these same people are themselves *wholly ignorant of the fact*; or, that they, with their eyes open, are *eager to deprive themselves of the benefit of this influence*; and, this, mind, we *must believe*; or, we *must believe* that Mr. O'CONNELL most *grossly deceives himself*; or, we *must believe* of him that which, of all things in the world, we would wish not to believe of any man whom we have been accustomed to respect.

If the small freeholders did give "*a frightful*" preponderating influence to the *great landholders*, and if they could "*traffic upon them* as if they were "*actual slaves*"; if this were the case, will common sense suffer us to believe, suffer us, for one single moment, to entertain the thought, that those great landholders would be *eager to get rid of them*; and that, though they are enemies to all concessions to the Catholics, they are ready to *agree to such concessions*, if these be coupled with a disfranchisement of those in whom they "*traffic as in so many actual slaves*"? Away with such absurdity! To affect to believe in it is too gross and barefaced to be called by any name not more harsh than even that of *hypocrisy*.

The "*perjury* and *crime*" are very bad, to be sure; but the worst of it is, they are, in this case, proposed to be checked by *Orangemen*. This is rather suspicious; and, then, this mode of checking them is precisely *the reverse* of the mode uniformly pursued in England, when any proof has been produced of their existence; and, which is not a little singular, precisely the reverse of the mode uniformly recommended and insisted upon with most clamorous vehemence

by that very Sir FRANCIS BURDETT, on whom, as we are told, is to alight the high honour of introducing (in company with his RUMP, I pray God!) this *disfranchising Bill*! When “*perjury and crime*” have been proved upon a borough to a great extent, so as to involve nearly the whole of the electors, what has been the *remedy*? What have been the means made use of to prevent the like in future? To *lessen the number of electors*? No: but to *augment the number*: to throw open the borough to a surrounding district; or to transfer the right of the borough to a county; and never, in any one case on record, to *diminish* the number of voters. And what has Sir FRANCIS BURDETT always recommended as the cure for “*perjury and crime*”? Why, an *extension* of the right of voting, even to *universal suffrage*! For nearly thirty years this was his constant cry. Upon fifty different occasions he has pushed his language upon this subject to an extent of vehemence bordering on what his and our enemies called high treason. Document upon document have come from under his pen, speech upon speech from his lips, insisting that *all men* had a right to vote, that it was tyranny to punish any man by laws made

by those who had not been chosen by that man, or, at least, in the choosing of whom that man had not had a voice. He has an hundred times represented to the people, that they had a right to disobey laws passed without their assent. No man living has pushed the doctrine so far as himself. When he has been told of the perjury and crime committed by poor electors, his answer has uniformly been, *augment the number of electors*. To be sure, he has of late been wonderfully silent upon this subject; but, so late as the fourth of April, 1821, he, being then in the neighbourhood of the King's Bench prison, wrote a letter to the Chairman of a Reform Meeting, held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern. This was the famous letter about the crib and the ass and the ox, which brought the conditional challenge from Mr. Canning, and the unconditional disclaimer, or word-eating, from the Baronet. In that letter he says, that, “to use the “slang of the Honourable House, “the people *out of doors*, the “prophane vulgar, perfectly understand the question of Reform. “For, in this enlightened age and “country, no one is, I take it, so “ignorant as not to know, that “to have is to have; that, if what

“ I acquire either by good fortune
 “ or the sweat of my brow, another
 “ can take from me without
 “ *my own consent*, it is not my
 “ property but his; that I am
 “ tenant at will, and that, if any
 “ set of men can make laws to
 “ imprison my person, *to which I*
 “ *have never consented*, my person
 “ is as insecure as my property;
 “ in other words, that Liberty and
 “ Property, the watchwords of
 “ our forefathers, are as ‘ sounding
 “ brass or a tinkling cymbal.’ ”
 In another part of the same letter
 he says, “ that, whenever the
 “ *public* shall have the appoint-
 “ ment of their own House of
 “ Commons, Liberty and Pro-
 “ perty will be secured, and not till
 “ then.” This brings the history of
 his doctrine down to the month of
 April, 1821; and are we to see him,
 in 1825, bringing in a Bill, not
 to prevent the public from giving
 their assent to laws, not to refuse
 to the governed the right of parti-
 cipating to this full extent in choos-
 ing the governors; not to say that
 men ought not to look upon the
 laws as oppressive, though they
 do not give their consent to the
 making of them; but a Bill (hear
 it, indignant Englishmen!) to take
 from those who already have the
 right of voting; to take from half
 a million of those that very right,

which he, only just four years ago,
 represented as the unquestionable
 right of us all. Over and over
 again, even to satiety, has he re-
 proached the people, and that,
 too, in a manner the most bitter,
 for not coming forward as one
 man to demand this their inherent
 right. How many times has he
 quoted Magna Charta to prove
 this right! But, why need I in-
 sist upon this. The Parlia-
 mentary Debates are full of his
 speeches upon this subject. So
 deadly was his anger against
 those who would not consent to
 reform upon these principles, that
 he refused to call the House of
 Commons a House of Commons: he
 called it *a room*; spoke of it
 as a place where there were late
hours and bad company; and now
 he tells the Catholics of Ireland to
 be of good cheer, for that he is
 satisfied, if they will but forget
 past injuries and remember past
 benefits, they will, in time, pro-
 duce “ *conviction in this House* ”;
 though, only four years ago, he
 told the whole country that the
 Members of that House were
 “ true to the interests of those
 “ who sent them there; the
 “ ox,” said he, “ knoweth his
 “ owner, and the ass his master’s
 “ crib, and they, at least, equal
 “ the ox and the ass in knowledge

" and virtue, and are, moreover, " superior to the Jews, for they " do know *their Maker*. I will, " however, boldly adduce their " example, as proof undeniable " of the benefits the people would " derive from *appointing their* " *own representatives*, seeing that " these gentlemen are ever true to " *their own and their patron's in-* " *terest*."

And is this the same man who is now about to propose to disfranchise nine-tenths of the free-holders of Ireland? Recollect, that he was no chicken in politics when he wrote this letter. He once, at a Crown-and-Anchor Purity-of-Election Dinner, took occasion to say, that, whatever else might be said of him, " no one could say that he was not a *consistent politician*." Taking into view the present proposition, if it really be true, as is stated in the letter of Mr. LAWLESS (which will be found in another part of the Register); if it really be true that he is to bring forward this proposition, he will have been *consistent* indeed, for the whole of his political life will have been one unbroken series of deceptions practised on the people.

He was no chicken when he wrote the letter of 1821. It was not the ebullition of the mind of a

young man; it did not proceed from want of knowledge of the subject upon which he was writing; he has now no thoughtlessness, no passion to plead; but we see a cool, a sedate, a settled design to unsay all that he has ever said, and undo all that he has ever done. What! and will he set up a cry against "*perjury and crime*" at elections; will he propose to disfranchise nine-tenths of the free-holders of Ireland, upon the bare, the naked, the unsupported charge of their enemies, of having been guilty of perjury and crime? Has he wholly forgotten the thrice renowned **MILLERS OF ISLE-WORTH**? Has he forgotten those poor men, who, out of zeal to serve him, who had filled them with a sort of phrenzy by his vehement appeals to their public spirit; has he wholly forgotten these poor men, who are certainly guilty of "*perjury and crime*"; but whose votes he and his councillors prevailed on the Sheriffs of London to take, which Sheriffs, Messrs. Alderman RAWLINS and COX, were, for that very act, sent into Newgate with the nicest tin-kettle tied to their tail, by the then Speaker, MR. ABBOT, the sound of which kettle ought to rattle in the ears of the Baronet whenever he shall be making a speech for the

disfranchisement of the freeholders of Ireland, some of whom may possibly have committed perjury and crime as flagrant as those of the poor millers ! But, if the perjury and crime of the millers, which was proved as clearly as daylight, never made any enemy of liberty, however great, bold enough to propose the disfranchisement of Middlesex, upon what ground will the representative of those unhappy millers propose to disfranchise half a million of freeholders in Ireland, against whom no crime has been proved, and no crime has been alleged ; and propose to disfranchise them, too, without any hearing in their own defence, and by the means of votes given by **Members**, into whose hands they have put the power of law-making, and whose bounden duty it is to yield them protection ?

Irishmen, crying as this enormity would be ; clearly as I prove it, I am not willing, in so important a matter, to leave you to rely solely upon opinions and arguments of mine. I have before me a letter written by the venerated **DOCTOR DOYLE**, one of your own **Bishops**, published in London not long ago. That gentleman, speaking on the subject of the proposed disfranchisement of Irish freeholders, has these words :

“ Take the elective franchise from the Irish peasant, and you not only strip him of the present reality or appearance of this right, but you disable him or his posterity ever to acquire it ; he is now the image of a freeman, he will then be the very essence of a slave. He may go to gaze at the election, and then return to hew his wood or fetch his water to the freeman ; an inhabitant, but not a citizen, of the country which gave him birth.” These are not my words, but the words of an Irish Catholic Bishop.

In another page of this excellent treatise, after remarking upon the lessons which we give to foreign nations upon the subject of admitting the people into a share of the Government, **DOCTOR DOYLE** asks, “ Whence, then, the thought of *inverting the process*, when we wish to cure our own diseases.” And, now, my friends, attend to the answer which **DOCTOR DOYLE** has prepared beforehand, as it were from a foreknowledge of what was to come to pass, to the opinions and imputations of **MR. O'CONNELL**. “ But it is said, though the forty-shilling freehold be abolished, and the qualification raised to 10*l.* or 20*l.* you will still have a great number possessed of the elective

"franchise. This supposition is unfounded; you will have but a small number, *and they more corrupt than the lowest class now are.* Freeholders will then be of that description of farming Esquires, who are always looking for some place for their children or friends, the hope of attaining which will supersede every other consideration. They will be the most corrupt class of electors in Europe."

Either, therefore, this venerable man and most able writer knows nothing of his country, in which he has been for so many years a most diligent pastor; or Mr. O'CONNELL is completely in error as to the mode of removing that perjury and crime which he gives as one of his reasons for assenting to this proposition. "As to the perjury and immorality," says DOCTOR DOYLE, "no man lame-ments them more than I do; but, are they to be removed by reducing still more the Irish peasant in the scale of political existence? By increasing to an incredible extent the number of paupers? By throwing the famished population into the hands of Captain Rock? By multiplying house burnings, robberies, assassinations, and murders? By raising up a

"class of heartless, unrelenting middlemen? By scourging the poor, not with rods, but with scorpions? Is there not in the heart of a freeman something [listen, Sir Francis Burdett] which would make him revolt from the idea of robbing of their birthright half a million of subjects, plunging them into a state of irremediable servitude, of hopeless despair, blotting their names for ever from the book of the Constitution?"

I wish the persons engaged in this measure to give us an answer to these questions before they further proceed. The Rump of Westminster, and the other hangers-on of the Baronet, who is now so docile and loyal a gentleman, represent me as factious, and a stirrer up of discontent. They cannot say this of DR. DOYLE. They cannot impute to him, who has laboured so zealously to promote conciliation and peace, and whose religion and whose profession teaches him to be a decided enemy to every thing approaching towards unlawful resistance; they cannot impute factious motives to him. Curious it is, that he should seem to have had every argument of these disfranchisers. "But," says he, "it is said that the forty-shilling

“ freeholders are now brought to “ the hustings like cattle. This is “ true of many of them. But “ what would be their condition if “ they could not vote? In place “ of forming the herd of the noble- “ man or wealthy commoner, they “ would be the lean and haggard “ and emaciated cattle of the “ middle-men; and these middle- “ men would decide the election “ by pounds, shillings and pence, “ as they would dispose of their “ bullocks at Smithfield.”

It would have been well if Mr. O'CONNELL had provided himself with a refutation of these grave opinions, before he wrote the letter to the Catholic Association. Not only are the opinions of DR. DOYLE of very great weight in themselves; but they are borne out by reason and experience. If these freeholders had no power at all, why so much anxiety to get rid of them on the part of those who are avowedly the enemies of Catholic Emancipation? “ But,” says DR. DOYLE, “ they *already* “ *have power*. And it is the *very* “ *exercise of this power, which* “ *has contributed to raise an out-* “ *cry against them.*” Aye! exclaims every man in his senses, to be sure it is. If they had had no power; if they had been covered with “ *perjury and crime;*” if

they were “ *trafficked upon as if* “ *they were actual slaves,*” as Mr. O'CONNELL says they are, never should we have heard of any outcry against them at all. This is so manifest, that there wanted no argument and no opinion in its support. DOCTOR DOYLE, just before concluding in the words of my motto, asks, “ What would be “ the use of emancipation, com- “ pared with the elective fran- “ chise? The Catholics should “ not listen to any proposal; they “ should *hold fast what they have*, “ and trust to God, to their own “ exertions, and to the justice of “ the legislature and their own “ cause, for the attainment of what “ is withheld;” and then he concludes by saying, “ No! I would “ expect, that, if it were proposed “ to the Catholics to barter the “ elective franchise for emanci- “ pation, they would indignantly “ reject the unworthy compro- “ mise.”

Before, therefore, Mr. O'CONNELL enjoined, in so pressing a manner, the Catholic Association and his beloved countrymen to give *no opinion* upon the “ *change of the elective franchise*” until he arrived amongst them; before he did this, he would have been prudent to take care that this letter of DR. DOYLE was burnt and

completely annihilated. It is not I, an Englishman and a Protestant, that am complaining of this proposition for the disfranchisement and degradation of my fellow-subjects, so much as it is one of their own prelates, universally admired for his talents, and universally beloved for his benevolence. He must know the state of the Irish people. He must know the interests of the Catholic religion as well, at least, as Mr. O'CONNELL. So far does he differ from that gentleman in opinion, that he regards the measure as the most unjust and inhuman. "Are these poor freeholders," says he, "with their wives and children, to die upon the scaffold or perish on the highways? " Is the legislature to become insensible to the cries of humanity, or to fill it with rivers of blood. I should hope not. I should hope that if it were resolved to pluck up the root of our liberties, some mode of doing it would be devised other than that of disfranchisement!"

Leaving Mr. O'CONNELL to answer DR. DOYLE, let me now turn to the reported introducer of the intended bill; and let me ask him how, if he do introduce a bill enacting the disfranchisement of the Irish freeholders, how he is

to look in the face, that Westminster of which he is "*the pride*", and that England of which he is "*the glory*"? DR. DOYLE has not overlooked the effect which such a measure would have upon England herself. "The *Englishman*," says he, "who does not " wish to see all hope of improvement in the representation " of his own country cut off, " should rally round the weak and " defenceless freeholders of Ireland; if they be sacrificed to the " ambition or selfishness of the " British Aristocracy, or to the " vengeance of Irish Orangemen, " the cause of civil liberty " throughout the empire, will receive the deepest wound which " has been inflicted on it for a " century." It were well if Sir Francis Burdett would lay by, for a while, that tone of aristocratic haughtiness which has of late so distinguished him, and muster up, if he can, something like argument wherewith to meet this Catholic Bishop. I should like to hear what reasons he has to give for this precedent not being extended to the counties of England, where, be it again remembered, we have the flagrant instance of *perjury and crime* in the Isleworth millers to resort to.

There appears to me to be no

the smallest reason for supposing that, if this improvement, as they call it, of the Irish representation were to take place, the precedent should not be extended to England ; and can any man suppose, that, if once begun in the counties, it will not be extended to the cities and open boroughs. A curious close we shall then have to this hero's achievements in the cause of radical reform.

If I am to judge from those vehicles to which the Baronet's Rump has access, I should anticipate a curious piece of special pleading about a *quid pro quo* ; about the Catholics giving up something for the something which they are to receive. I should like to know, therefore, what it is that the Irish poor freeholders are to receive. I know of nothing that they are to receive of equal value to that elective franchise of which it is proposed to deprive them. I can see that a few lawyers might obtain silk gowns, and be allowed to sigh for the Bench ; I can perceive that half a dozen thorough-paced Catholic tools might be allowed to be present at the making of laws ; I can perceive that a few Lords would take their seats in the Upper House ; but, for the *Catholic people*, stripped of their political rights, stripped, as

the Baronet said in his Letter of 1821, of their "*liberty and property*," subject to laws made by men in the appointment of whom they had no voice ; for a *Catholic people*, thus stripped and degraded, I can see nothing *to be received* from the proposed bill, but that stripping and that degradation.

I agree perfectly with Mr. LAWLESS, that the sum total of the measure is, to give Catholics the seats, and to deprive them of the power of filling them ; to give them emancipation in name, and perpetual slavery in reality. But, if it be to be considered as a *quid pro quo*, where is the thing to be received by the Irish *Protestant freeholder*. Upon what ground would Westminster's Pride and the glory of England deprive *him* of his right of voting ? It is wholly false to say, that the Irish Catholic freeholder would obtain any compensation, unless it were in the delectable feelings inspired by the thought that his subscription to the *Catholic Rent* has purchased him the loss of his political rights. But, as to the Irish *Protestant freeholder*, a face covered with ten bull-hides would blush at hearing it pretended that any compensation had been awarded to him. Come, then, "*man of the people*," hero of radical re-

form, come and tell us how you make it out that the Protestant freeholder is to be deprived of his right in exchange for that which he receives.

There is great awkwardness here, too, when we compare this idea of a *quid pro quo* with Mr. O'CONNELL's opinion, that the disfranchisement will add "to the *Catholic influence*." This latter gentleman is full of praises of Sir FRANCIS; extols his wisdom and zeal; but they should settle, then, this difference in their songs. Agreeing as they do: going along harmoniously in this great and glorious undertaking of disfranchising "emancipation," they should take care not to differ so widely in essentials. Sir FRANCIS looks upon the Catholic people as *giving up* something in the loss of their elective franchise, while, unfortunately, Mr. O'CONNELL looks upon them as *gaining something* by it. With the former, all is gain to the Catholics; he can see a benefit even in disfranchisement; with the latter, something is given up and something received in exchange.

The introducer of this Bill will have a *speech* to make, in which speech, he will have to show to the people of Ireland, that the greater part of those whom he

calls "the most docile people in the world," and those whom he would choose to live amongst, are, after all, so bad, so radically debased and corrupt, so much worse than even the Isleworth millers, as to be unworthy of enjoying that right which he has for many years contended ought to be enjoyed by **EVERY man in England!** The Baronet is very ingenious in stating and in solving paradoxes. But though, doubtless, the Rump has flattered him into a belief that nothing is too difficult for his powers, he will find, I believe, that, before he persuade the Irish people to this, every hair upon his head will be as white as snow. People are not easily persuaded that they are worse than the rest of mankind, and that they ought to be stripped of that which is alone their protection. When this hero of reform was writing his Letter of 1821, he said that every one knew, that "*to have was to have*"; but he must certainly believe now that the freeholders of Ireland are not yet enlightened enough to possess this important branch of knowledge. They, poor fellows, do not know that *to have is to have*; or, at least, so he must think, before he could make himself the author of this proposition.

Irishmen, your cause has recommended itself to the good and wise in England by your long-tried fidelity to the faith of your fathers. Your sufferings, your degradation, were about to cease ; the sunshine of real freedom was bursting forth upon you ; what then must be the mortification of your friends at seeing you thrown back again into the darkness of slavery ! Those who anxiously wished you *emancipation*, have now to dread your *disranchisement* under that specious name ; and, to add one more singularity to all those singularities that have marked your melancholy history of three hundred years, when ruffian sacrilege first laid its hands on your saintly shrines, you have now to be preserved, if preserved at all, from deeper degradation than ever, by that very ARISTOCRACY, against whom the intended proposer of disfranchising "emancipation" has, a thousand times, inveighed, as the unbending enemies of freedom, civil and religious, and whom the working of this new and over-zealous convert to the borough-faith is about to exhibit to the world as the only remaining barrier between monopoly of power and popular rights. That this barrier will be interposed, that you will be preserved, that you will not be sacrificed at the shrine of

selfishness and vanity, is both my hope and belief. You will be where you were : but, where will those be, who shall have proposed the offering, bound the unoffending victim, prepared the pile, and begun to chant the unhallowed and inhuman rites !

W.M. COBBETT.

P. S. The London press is *strangely puzzled*. It dares not approve of this daring project ; and yet it would almost as lief perish as follow me. The MORNING CHRONICLE is in the most *pitious plight of all*. It dares not advocate *confiscation of rights*, and yet, to come creeping at my heels would break its proud heart. It is in precisely that state, which the country people call, "*between hawk and buzzard*."—Come, SAWNEY : pluck up, man ! Give yourself a scratch and say something. Do not stand any longer to see which way the cat jumps.

MR. LAWLESS' LETTER.

N.B. I agree with Mr. Lawless in all he says, except his praise of Sir FRANCIS BURDETT ; and, I must leave to Mr. LAWLESS to explain on what *principle* it is, that he *praises* the *proposer* of a measure, which he represents as a *treason against the poor peasantry of Ireland*.

*To the Editor of the Morning
Herald*

Tavistock Hotel, London, March 13.

SIR,—I have read in an Irish paper, which arrived in this city on Saturday last, a letter, signed "Daniel O'Connell," of which, as one of the Deputation from Ireland, I feel it my duty to take this public notice. I cannot hesitate to say, that I regret much that my respected countryman should have given his opinion, even as a *private individual*, on the merits of that new Parliamentary arrangement which is sometimes denominated the Catholic Emancipation Bill. But as O'Connell has thought proper to exercise his undoubted privilege of giving his own individual opinion of this Bill, with all its accompaniments, he will concede me the same right, when I write under the conviction that the measure he so much praises is deserving the contempt and indignation of every man in the British Empire, inasmuch as it goes to delude and betray a generous people into the sanction of principles degrading to the character of the Catholics of Ireland—most injurious to the political and civil rights of the Irish peasantry, and destructive to the hopes of all those enlightened and valuable men who have so long laboured to extend and enlarge the political power of the people. It is quite true that Mr. O'Connell is backed in the opinion he has given by great and distinguished names—by men who justly boast of the confidence of the Irish people. Mr. O'Connell is supported in this opinion by the venerated name of Sir Francis Burdett; and he is also supported by many members of the Deputation from Ireland. Opposed to such authorities, I may say I have little more than the justice of the cause I plead, and this is an answer in which I feel I am invulnerable. I confess I cannot account for my blindness in not being able to discover the splendid excellences of

the arrangement which Mr. O'Connell so much panegyrizes; I can see nothing but deformity where my friend finds beauty; I can see nothing but insincerity and delusion where he finds candour and fair dealing. I think that the present Parliamentary machinery, so ingeniously put in play by Mr. Plunkett, is nothing more than an improvement on the more candid hostility of the Bill of 1821, introduced by the same gentleman—the same effort to dishonour the Irish Catholic Clergy—the same effort to separate the people from their best and most faithful guardians—the same system of corrupt influence—the same dexterity to blast the principle of reform, and to add to that Parliamentary corruption, on the aid of which Mr. Plunkett at this moment depends for the success of his scheme of Emancipation. You will say, no doubt, it is very strange that, if it be true, such are the leading features of this new Parliamentary experiment, that O'Connell should be the first trumpeter of its peculiar claims on the respect and support of the Irish nation; I shall therefore proceed to call your attention, and that of the people of England as well as Ireland, to the *wings*, as they are facetiously termed, of this new bird from the cage of our honest, sincere, and able advocate, Mr. Plunkett—of this Learned Gentleman I hope I shall be found to speak with all the praise his peculiar excellences deserve. Sir Francis Burdett will pardon me, and so will Mr. O'Connell, if I decline to admit the sincerity of that statesman in the cause of the Emancipation of the Catholics of Ireland, who takes good care that the Bill of Emancipation shall be accompanied and clogged with additions, which will insure its almost universal unpopularity among the very people whom he professes to serve. So much for Mr. Plunkett's sincerity, of which Mr. O'Connell is as much satisfied as Mr. Plunkett was of that of Lord Castlereagh.

Both, it seems, are sincere and honest men; let the people of England and Ireland judge of Mr. Plunkett's sincerity by the character of the conditions on which Catholic Emancipation is about to be conceded. In the first place, there is a Board to be constituted composed of Catholics—the appointment to be sanctioned by the Irish Government, whose duty, it is said, is to be limited to the exclusion of foreigners from the Catholic Prelacy of Ireland, and to the reporting to the Government the characters of the persons seeking ecclesiastical promotion in the Catholic Church; to the registering of their places of birth; and the communication of all such information as may best regulate the mind of the Irish Government in the distribution of the *annual stipend*, of which I shall speak hereafter. It seems that this Board, in the contemplation of Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. O'Connell, and some of the friends on the Deputation, will be an innocent, harmless establishment, exercising a wholesome control over the appointment of the Catholic Clergy of Ireland. In this I differ from Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. O'Connell. I am of opinion, and in this opinion I believe I shall be joined by every independent Catholic in Ireland, that the Board which I have described will be hereafter a source of perpetual intrigue—a species of ecclesiastical inquisition into the political as well as moral conduct of every Catholic Clergyman, and a powerful instrument of corruption in the hands of an artful Minister. The constitution of such a Board is an insult to the Catholic Prelacy and Clergy of Ireland—an evidence of the distrust entertained by Mr. Plunkett of the loyalty and fidelity of the very men he has panegyrized, uncalled for by the English people, and only suggested by those persons who are perfectly satisfied it may be a successful impediment to that Emancipation they affect to be anxious to promote. What is the next condi-

tion of this Emancipation measure of Mr. Plunkett?—The sacrifice of the political rights of the Irish peasantry, which the lamented Grattan, in 1793, considered to be the *Magna Charta* of the poor man in Ireland, and which the justly celebrated Dr. Doyle considers his best shield in the year 1825—the poor man in Ireland, the 40s. freeholder, is to be robbed of his vote to conciliate the Minister, who would suffer Mr. O'Connell to wear a silk gown, or Lord Killeen to take his seat in the House of Lords—the Irish peasantry are to be robbed of their elective franchise, in order, says the sincere Mr. Plunkett, to promote the independence and importance of the Catholics of Ireland, and O'Connell echoes the opinion! What! would the proposal be made if the honesty of the Catholic 40s. elector were not dreaded by those advocates of Emancipation? Would the Catholic 40s. freeholder be thus robbed of his power to elect, if Mr. Plunkett and his High Church friends did not fear that Catholic Representatives from Ireland would be too numerous—that the people would be apt to vote for the men who most enjoyed their confidence? And, therefore, says Mr. Plunkett, with his accustomed sincerity, “I will make Catholics “eligible to places in Parliament, “but I will take care, good care, that “they shall have no electors!” Is this arrangement honest to the poor people of Ireland, who have increased and multiplied under the operation of the privilege they now enjoy, and whose numbers strike terror into some of the miserable legislators whom Ireland sends to the Imperial Parliament? Why, to be sure. Mr. Plunkett is *sincere* in making such a condition a *sine qua non* of this Emancipation Bill; but why Sir Francis Burdett and O'Connell, both honest Reformers, should treat the Irish peasantry *thus*, is a riddle I cannot solve. It has been said that the forty-shillings freeholders are brought to the hustings like so many cattle to the slaughter. I answer,

that if even this were true to the extent stated, the *necessity* of so bringing them up is in itself a great political privilege to the Irish Catholic. But I deny the fact. - I assert that even before Emancipation, the forty shillings freeholders in Ireland have manifested a spirit and zeal in support of public freedom worthy of the best examples in England. Who sustained Colclough in Wexford, or White in Dublin?—the much insulted and calumniated forty shillings freeholders. And if these splendid instances existed before Emancipation, what would be their conduct if Emancipation passed, and competition thrown open to those who command the hearts and affections of the Irish people? But is this the principle of the Reformer, to narrow the circle of the Elective suffrage? Is this the example which *Ireland united* is to set to the people of England? Is this the practice of that broad and comprehensive theory so powerfully urged in Parliament for the last thirty years? And above all, is this the return which the poor persecuted peasant of Ireland is to receive for his unconquerable fidelity to the religion and freedom of his native land? What, then, can such an arrangement be considered but an act of *High Treason* to the Irish peasantry—an act which will damn those who consent to it in the estimation of every man who wishes to extend the circle of public liberty? For these reasons, I, for *one*, object to this condition, and certain I am there is not a man who wishes well to the tranquillity of Ireland—who would guard the Irish peasantry from the intrigues of Captain Rock—who will not join me in the opposition to a measure which must drive the peasant from his present miserable cabin to the more wretched shelter of the mountain, his little garden and field being no longer worthy the protection or care of his ambitious landlord. Were there no other *wing* than this to the Emancipation Bill of Mr. Plunkett, it would be a *wing*

of lead, which should never suffer it to rise; but there is another *wing* of exquisite workmanship—Ireland is to have *a pensioned Clergy*; and yet I am told by Mr. O'Connell and others, that there is *nothing at all of Veto or vetoistical arrangement* sought for or desired—*nothing but the affectionate gratitude of the Irish people*;—why, this is a credulity which I did not imagine our most credulous countrymen would be guilty of!—Why are the Irish Catholic Clergy to be pensioned?—is no value to be given for the annual stipend? will not the eye of the Irish Government be allowed to take its dimensions of the character and physiognomy of the aspiring candidates for the Catholic priesthood—a *Catholic require Donum?* is the present Government so simple as to give the money for nothing—for the mere gratitude of the Irish priests?—No, no: let the Catholic Clergy of Ireland be pensioned, and the same result will follow to the Catholic Church of Ireland which has followed to all other religious establishments similarly endowed; the people are alienated from their pastors, and the latter cease to perform the duties of their Ministry with their accustomed zeal and industry; confidence will be destroyed, and the Catholic priest of Ireland will be hereafter going to the Castle to receive the annual wages for which the people have received no value. Thus, one of the most exemplary, parental, and beloved order of men that ever adorned a country will become the pensioners of the Castle of Dublin, and the eaters of the taxes of the British empire. How much, then, is it to be regretted that the Irish Catholic advocate should come down from the high and respected ground of *unqualified and unconditional Emancipation*—this was the ground which raised the Irish nation in the opinion of the English people; which created the feeling that was lately displayed in the House of Commons; and which will ultimately accomplish

the triumph of the cause : a departure from that ground will cover its advocates with the contempt of the English nation, and make it a party against the concession of those rights which they are now ready to surrender. Admitting the purity of motive of those who differ from me, I trust I may put in my claim to a similar feeling, when I oppose, to the best of my power, a Parliamentary arrangement which I conceive to be dishonourable to all parties, and cruel to the poor people of Ireland.

I remain,
Your very humble Servant,
JOHN LAWLESS.

LETTERS
FROM FRANCE
AND
THE NETHERLANDS.

A Book, with this title, and with my second son, JOHN M. COBBETT, for the author, will speedily be published. He went to France in April last; went as far south as the city of LIMOGES; staid there and thereabouts until July; came back to Paris to see an edition of my *French Grammar* through the press; was there when the late king died; rode on horse-back through Burgundy, Alsace, and then on to the Rhine, across to Bruxelles, and back to St. Omers and Calais, and returned home about three months ago. The LETTERS, which he is now about to publish, were written to me, at my request, and I have been so much delighted with them myself, that I wish them to be published. I must, in this case, necessarily be a very partial judge, and, therefore, I shall say nothing in praise of this production, anxious as I may be, that the public may think

of it as I do. However, it is *something* to be able to write a book at all; and my readers and friends, when they reflect on the horrible means that have been, for so many years, made use of to *extinguish me*, and that, too, by such tremendous power, will, I am sure, think that I am justified in feeling some degree of pride, that I have, through all these terrible storms, brought up three sons (the fourth is not quite eleven years old), each of whom is, when necessary, able to stand forth with the pen; and, of which I am still more proud, the whole of whom are most exemplarily sober and laborious. They have, God knows, seen enough to make them detest Corruption and all her tribes. They have had experience in abundance: the abominations practised against their father have not been without their benefit. To save numerous inquirers the trouble they are now frequently put to, and put me to, I will mention: that my son, WILLIAM, who is the author of the "LAW OF TURNPIKES," and who is now going to take a *Ride through Ireland*, is my eldest son; that JOHN, who is the author of the work that I announce, is my second son; that JAMES, who is the author of the *RIDE IN FRANCE*, is my third son; and, that they are all *Students of Lincoln's Inn*, having entered that Society a year ago.

SEEDS.

Swedish Turnip Seed and Mangel Wurzle Seed. I have some of the very best of both. The former is 1s. 3d. a pound, if ten pounds are taken; and 1s. 6d. if

a less quantity. The latter, 2s. 3d. a pound, if *ten* pounds: and 2s. 6d. if less. I warrant them both, having grown them myself from picked and transplanted roots. Please to apply at No. 183, Fleet-street.

The *Swedish Turnip Seed* is of precisely the same sort as that, from which the *great crop*, mentioned in the Register some time ago, was grown in *Scotland*. And the *MANGEL WURZLE* seed is from plants, some plants of which weighed not less than *thirty pounds* each, and the seed-stalks of which were more than *ten feet high*. The plants were all selected, and none planted for seed but those of the *deepest red*, which colour is a sure indication of the goodness of the sort. Those plants, the flesh of which is *white*, have degenerated.

N. B. Any gentleman, in *Ireland*, who may wish to be supplied with these seeds, will please to apply to Mr. SCULLY, Bookseller, Upper Orman Quay, Dublin, to whom I shall send some very shortly. The *Mangel Wurzle* should not be sown before *early in June*. If sown earlier, it is apt to go to seed the first year.

SPRING WHEAT. I have about 30 bushels, which I sell at 14s. a bushel, which is, as nearly as I can ascertain, what it cost me. This is the wheat for *bonnet-straw*. It may be sown *till May*. See *Cottage Economy*, last edition, paragraphs 224 to 227.

GARDENING BOOK.

My Book on **GARDENING** is called the "*American Gardener*,"

and it was written for use in the *United States*. Two large editions have been sold *here*. But, it is now out of print, and I shall, in its stead, publish, in a few weeks, "*The English Gardener*." The other work was not adapted to *our seasons*; and, besides, it said nothing of *wall-trees*, which is a great subject with us, and of the *pruning* of which it is necessary to say *a great deal*; for, on it depends almost the whole of the success in getting fruit, and in getting it fine. On the subject of *grafting* and *budding*, and particularly on the subject of planting *orchards*, I have a great deal to say, that I think will be very useful.

ASH TREES.

I HAVE about *twelve thousand*, which have been *removed*, which have fine roots, and are, on an average, three and a half feet high, which I will sell for *thirty shillings a thousand*, if the whole together, and *two pounds a thousand*, if less quantity. I will pack and send off from London at my own expense.

CATHOLIC APPEAL.

IN consequence of the base conduct of the London daily press, I have published this *Appeal*, price *a halfpenny, or three shillings a hundred*. Any Gentleman in the country, who wishes to distribute it in his neighbourhood, may be instantly supplied by writing to No. 183, Fleet Street.

MARKETS.

Average Prices of CORN throughout ENGLAND, for the week ending March 5.

Per Quarter.

	s. d.		s. d.
Wheat ..	65 11	Oats	23 3
Rye	39 0	Beans	38 2
Barley ..	40 2	Peas	42 8

Corn Exchange, Mark Lane.

Quantities and Prices of British Corn, &c. sold and delivered in this Market, during the week ended Saturday, March 5.

	Qrs.	£.	s. d.	s. d.
Wheat	8,024 for 28,160	17	1	Average, 70 2
Barley	9,066	19,604 3	4.....43 2
Oats ..	12,317	15,693 9	10.....25 5
Rye	53	101 14	3.....38 4
Beans ..	3,160	6,079 6	4.....38 4
Pease ..	1,317	2,726 14	6.....41 4

Friday, March 11.—The arrivals of all sorts of Grain this week are good, and of Oats very large. There was a brisk trade for prime samples of Wheat, but of other sorts there was not much doing. Prime samples of Barley also commanded attention, but the trade for other sorts was dull. Beans and Peas remain the same as last Monday. There was not much trade for Oats to-day, and prices have declined 1s. per qr. from the terms of Monday. The Flour trade remains as before.

Monday, March 14.—The arrivals of Wheat and Flour last week were tolerably good, but of Barley and Oats

the quantity was very large. This morning the fresh supplies of Wheat, Barley, Beans, and Peas, from Essex, Kent, and Suffolk, are only moderate, and there are a good many more vessels fresh up from the North, with Wheat and Oats. Prime Wheat alone met a free sale this morning at last Monday's prices; other sorts are dull and lower.

Barley has experienced a very heavy trade to-day, and is 1s. to 2s. per quarter cheaper for all qualities. Beans have sold heavily and barely maintain our currency. Boiling Peas are reduced 2s. per qr. Grey Peas are 1s. per qr. cheaper. Oats are plentiful and very heavy on sale, at 1s. per qr. reduction from the terms of this day se'nnight. The Flour trade remains unaltered.

Price on board Ship as under.

Flour, per sack	60s. — 65s.
— Seconds	56s. — 60s.
— North Country ..	52s. — 55s.

Account of Wheat, &c. arrived in the Port of London, from March 7 to March 12, both inclusive.

	Qrs.	Qrs.
Wheat ..	7,666	Tares 1,527
Barley ..	11,339	Linseed .. 2,825
Malt	6,230	Rapeseed .. 509
Oats	36,433	Brank .. 795
Beans	2,372	Mustard .. —
Flour	9,210	Flax —
Rye	12	Hemp —
Peas	1,441	Seeds 80

Foreign.—Wheat, 190; Barley, 6095; Oats, 1210; Flour, 271.

Total Quantity of Corn returned as
Sold in the Maritime Districts, for
the Week ended March 5.

Qrs.	Qrs.
Wheat .. 35,948	Oats 39,129
Rye 301	Beans 7,410
Barley .. 39,273	Peas 2,103

HOPS.

Price of Hops per Cwt. in the
Borough.

Monday, March 14.—The market
has been brisker last week, and Sus-
sex and Kent pockets may be stated
4s. to 6s. dearer. More enquiry for
Old ones. Currency, Sussex, 6*l.* to
6*l.* 12*s.*; Kent, 6*l.* 6*s.* to 7*l.* 7*s.*

Maidstone, March 10.—For good
Hops there has been a demand this
week, and a few lots disposed of at
rather better prices, which looks fa-
vourable for the coming crop, as the
Stock of Hops of that description be-
gins now to be much exhausted.

Monday, March 14.—The arrivals
from Ireland last week were 4,270
firkins of Butter, and 4,132 bales of
Bacon; and from Foreign Ports
2714 casks of Butter.

City, 16th March, 1825.

BACON

On board, 56*s.* to 57*s.* Landed,
59*s.* to 60*s.*

BUTTER.

Landed: Carlow, 106*s.* to 108*s.*;

Dublin, or Waterford, 100*s.* to 102*s.*
Best Dutch, 110*s.* to 112*s.*

CHEESE.

Cheshire, 64*s.* to 74*s.*; Double
Gloster, 62*s.* to 68*s.*; Derby, 64*s.* to
70*s.* The very general distress, and
consequent failures, amongst the
Retailers, has greatly embarrassed
the Wholesale men, many of whom
have suspended their payments. The
prospect is a very gloomy one, for all
parties.

SMITHFIELD, Monday, March 14.

Per Stone of 8 pounds (alive).

	s. d.	s. d.
Beef	4 4	to 5 0
Mutton ...	5 4	— 6 0
Veal	6 0	— 7 0
Pork	5 4	— 6 4
Beasts ... 2,724		Sheep .. 13,520
Calves ... 110		Pigs ... 130

NEWGATE, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s. d.	s. d.
Beef	3 8	to 4 8
Mutton ...	3 8	— 5 0
Veal	4 0	— 6 8
Pork	4 8	— 6 8

LEADENHALL, (same day.)

Per Stone of 8 pounds (dead).

	s. d.	s. d.
Beef	3 4	to 4 8
Mutton ...	4 0	— 5 0
Veal	4 0	— 6 0
Pork	4 10	— 6 4

Price of Bread.—The price of the 4lb. Loaf is stated at 11d. by the full-priced Bakers.

POTATOES.

SPITALFIELDS.—per Ton.	
Ware	£3 0 to £5 10
Middlings	2 10 — 3 0
Chats	2 10 — 0 0
Common Red.	0 0 — 0 0

BOROUGH.—per Ton.

BOROUGH.—per Ton.	
Ware	£3 10 to £5 0
Middlings	2 10 — 3 0
Chats	1 15 — 2 5
Common Red.	3 10 — 4 10

HAY and STRAW, per Load.

Smithfield.	— Hay... 60s. to 95s.
	Straw... 40s. to 48s.
	Clover.. 80s. to 110s.
St. James's.	— Hay... 65s. to 105s.
	Straw... 36s. to 51s.
	Clover.. 80s. to 105s.
Whitechapel.	— Hay... 70s. to 100s.
	Straw... 45s. to 52s.
	Clover.. 80s. to 120s.

COAL MARKET, March 11.

Ships at Market. Ships sold. Price.	
31½ Newcastle..	26½ 29s. 6d. to 38s. 9d.
7 Sunderland..	7 35s. 6d.—41s. 6d.

COUNTRY CORN MARKETS.

By the QUARTER, excepting where otherwise named; from Wednesday to Saturday last, inclusive.

The Scotch Markets are the Returns of the Week before.

	<i>Wheat.</i> s. to s. d.	<i>Barley.</i> s. to s. d.	<i>Oats.</i> s. to s. d.	<i>Beans.</i> s. to s. d.	<i>Pease.</i> s. to s. d.
Aylesbury	72 79 0	40 46 0	24 27 0	32 48 0	44 47 0
Banbury	68 80 0	45 48 0	26 30 0	38 50 0	0 0 0
Basingstoke	64 74 0	35 48 0	20 28 0	38 50 0	0 0 0
Bridport.....	60 68 0	30 40 0	21 23 0	44 0 0	0 0 0
Chelmsford.....	64 81 0	32 48 0	25 32 0	30 32 0	36 50 0
Derby	70 76 0	38 51 0	26 31 0	44 52 0	0 0 0
Devizes.....	40 80 0	28 50 0	22 34 0	42 54 0	0 0 0
Dorchester.....	55 68 0	37 43 0	24 29 0	48 50 0	0 0 0
Exeter.....	64 76 0	36 40 0	22 24 0	44 48 0	0 0 0
Eye	60 74 0	28 44 0	20 30 0	32 42 0	32 36 0
Guildford	58 87 0	34 48 0	24 32 0	41 47 0	41 46 0
Henley	67 83 0	28 52 0	22 30 0	33 50 0	42 49 0
Hornecastle.....	63 68 0	36 44 0	20 28 0	40 48 0	0 0 0
Hungerford.....	60 76 0	30 43 0	23 34 0	40 58 0	0 0 0
Lewes	70 76 0	40 46 0	25 27 0	40 0 0	40 0 0
Newbury	52 77 0	26 49 0	18 30 0	30 48 0	40 44 0
Newcastle	54 68 0	32 44 0	21 27 0	38 43 0	38 56 0
Northampton....	73 77 0	43 47 0	23 27 0	38 49 0	0 0 0
Nottingham	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Reading	65 86 0	32 51 0	18 32 0	38 44 0	42 49 0
Stamford.....	52 73 0	37 49 6	21 33 6	39 54 0	0 0 0
Stowmarket	54 56 0	28 44 0	22 30 0	32 36 0	32 36 0
Swansea	66 0 0	34 0 0	21 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Truro	67 0 0	37 0 0	28 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Uxbridge	64 87 0	35 50 0	25 32 0	36 50 0	42 46 0
Worminster.....	50 74 0	27 53 0	23 30 0	34 58 0	0 0 0
Winchester.....	60 80 0	34 45 0	24 29 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
Dalkeith*	30 37 0	28 33 6	17 23 0	18 22 0	18 23 0
Haddington*....	31 38 6	27 36 0	18 27 0	16 21 0	16 20 0

* Dalkeith and Haddington are given by the *boll*.—The Scotch *boll* for Wheat, Rye, Pease, and Beans, is three per cent. more than 4 bushels. The *boll* of Barley and Oats, is about 6 bushels Winchester, or as 6 to 8 compared with the English *quarter*.

Liverpool, March 8.—The importations of the past week having been considerable in the leading articles of the Corn trade, evidently tended to suppress the ardour for speculation which existed on Tuesday last, as the prices then obtained could not be acquired towards the end of that week. And the market of this day having been sparingly attended, there was very little business done in any article, although the finest qualities of Wheat were offered at a reduction of 3d. per bushel. Malt was 3d. lower, and Oats extremely dull; in fact, every article of the trade partook of the depression.

Imported into Liverpool, from the 1st to the 7th of March, 1825, inclusive:—Wheat, 8,675; Barley, 1,131; Oats, 22,388; Malt, 2,608; Beans, 1,493; and Peas, 36 quarters. Flour, 1,513 sacks, per 280 lbs. Oatmeal, 2,965 packs, per 240 lbs. American Flour, 1,113 barrels.

Bristol, March 12.—The supplies of Corn here are not large, to balance which the demand is rather limited. The prices below stated may at present be obtained.—Best Wheat from 8s. 9d. to 9s.; new ditto, 6s. 6d. to 8s.; inferior ditto, 5s. 6d. to 6s. 3d.; Barley, 3s. to 5s. 10d.; Beans, 4s. to 7s.; Oats, 2s. 3d. to 3s. 3d.; and Malt, 5s. 6d. to 8s. per bushel. Flour, Seconds, 30s. to 53s. per bag.

Birmingham, March 10.—We are better supplied with Wheat to-day, chiefly from Lincolnshire, but the prices of last week are fully supported. Flour has risen again 2s. to 3s. per sack, and the retail price has gone up 2d. per 14 lbs., being now 3s. per 14 lbs. for Seconds, and 3s. 6d. for Fine.

Ipswich, March 12.—We had to-day a fair supply of Grain, and the sale was dull at lower prices, as follow: Wheat, 63s. to 76s.; Barley, 30s. to 45s.; Beans, 35s. to 37s.; and Oats, 24s. to 28s. per quarter.

Wisbech, March 12.—The market here to-day was heavy for all sorts of Grain, but the prices of last week generally maintained.

Boston, March 9.—There has been a good supply of all Grain to-day. Wheat of fine quality is 2s. per qr. dearer, inferior 1s. Oats are without alteration, and all taken off. Beans more in request, and dry ones rather dearer. Barley has more buyers, and higher prices are wanted.

Wakefield, March 11.—There is a fair supply of Grain. The buyers generally showed but little disposition to purchase; the advance, however, in all the country markets, induced the sellers to hold firmly. Fine Wheat found a limited sale at the rates of this day se'nnight, but other sorts could not be quitted on equal terms. Very little done in Barley. The Maltsters buy scarce any but the best qualities, which nearly support last week's prices. Oats and Shelling are rather lower.

Hull, March 11.—The holders of the best Wheats demanded an advance of 2s. to 3s. per qr., which was met with great reluctance on the part of the purchasers, and but few sales were effected until nearly the close of the market, when a proportion of the choicest samples were disposed of at 1s. to 2s. per quarter above the currency of this day se'nnight; but the sales proceeded slowly, and the market was by no means cleared. Barley and Oats too, were in demand, and each a trifle dearer.

Lynn, March 10.—We had a moderate supply of Wheat at market on Tuesday, and the finest samples met ready sale at an advance of 1s. to 2s. per quarter. Barley was in good demand.

COUNTRY CATTLE AND MEAT MARKETS, &c.

Horncastle, March 12.—Beef, 7s. to 7s. 6d. per stone of 14 lbs.; Mutton, 6d. to 7d.; Pork, 6d. to 7½d.; and Veal, 9d. to 10d. per lb.

Bristol, March 10.—Beef, from 6d. to 6½d.; Mutton, 7d. to 8d.; and Pork, 6d. to 6½d. per lb. sinking offal.

Malton, March 12.—Meat in the shambles.—Beef, 7d. to 7½d.; Mutton, 7d. to 7½d.; and Pork, 6½d. to 7d.; and 8½d.; per lb. Fresh Butter, 16d. to 17d. per lb.; Salt ditto, nominal. Bacon Sides, 7s. 6d. to 7s. 9d. Hams, 8s. to 9s. 9d. per stone.

Manchester, March 9.—On sale 1201 Sheep, at 7d. to 9d. per lb. sinking the offal; 463 Cattle, at 6d. to 8d.; 72 Pigs.—Total 1736.

Morpeth Market, on Wednesday, was well supplied with Cattle; there being a great demand, they sold readily at an advance in price. There was rather a short supply of Sheep; prices much the same.—Beef, from 6s. to 16s. 9d.; Mutton, 6s. 9d. to 7s. 2d. per stone, sinking offal.

AVERAGE PRICE OF CORN, sold in the Maritime Counties of England and Wales, for the Week ended March 5, 1825.

	Wheat.		Barley.		Oats.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
<i>London</i> *	69	9	44	7	25	7
<i>Essex</i>	69	7	41	3	25	11
<i>Kent</i>	69	3	45	0	25	1
<i>Sussex</i>	69	2	39	6	23	10
<i>Suffolk</i>	68	6	39	1	25	6
<i>Cambridgeshire</i>	65	8	38	7	20	0
<i>Norfolk</i>	64	5	37	0	25	0
<i>Lincolnshire</i>	65	9	42	9	22	1
<i>Yorkshire</i>	62	4	40	0	22	7
<i>Durham</i>	61	0	43	0	23	10
<i>Northumberland</i>	59	9	38	3	24	6
<i>Cumberland</i>	63	6	36	5	22	7
<i>Westmoreland</i>	65	5	38	0	24	6
<i>Lancashire</i>	66	3	39	2	25	0
<i>Cheshire</i>	66	3	50	8	26	7
<i>Gloucestershire</i>	67	10	43	3	26	1
<i>Somersetshire</i>	67	6	41	1	22	1
<i>Monmouthshire</i>	67	9	42	4	24	4
<i>Devonshire</i>	67	10	38	7	23	0
<i>Cornwall</i>	64	0	36	10	24	4
<i>Dorsetshire</i>	66	6	38	10	25	1
<i>Hampshire</i>	66	8	39	0	24	8
<i>North Wales</i>	55	11	40	1	20	6
<i>South Wales</i>	61	1	34	10	19	0

* The London Average is always that of the Week preceding.